

OHIO FIELD OFFICE PERFORMANCE PLAN ASSESSMENT- Safety Management

Performance Board Review Matrix - Strategies and Performance Measures

STATUS FLAGS: O On Track Strategy or Performance Measure is Inappropriate

 $REPORTING\ LEGEND:\ (AB)\ A shtabula;\ (CL)\ Columbus;\ (FN)\ Fernald;\ (MB)\ Miamisburg;\ (WV)\ West\ Valley;\ (FO)\ Functional\ Offices$

COMMITMENT FLAGS: Δ FY2001 Upper Level Commitments

| | | | | | | S | TATU | s Fla | A G | | | | |
|------------|----------------------|-------------------|--|--------|---------|----|------|-------|--------------|----|----|----|--|
| | | | | Deceml | oer 200 | 00 | | | January 2001 | | | | |
| STRATEGIES | PERFORMANCE MEASURES | AB CL FN MB WV FO | | | | FO | AB | CL | FN | MB | WV | FO | |

KEY SUCCESS FACTOR A.1.- Implement a Sound ESH&Q Culture to Guide Ohio Field Office Activities

OBJECTIVE 1: Integrate and Embed Sound Environment, Safety, Health, and Quality Practices into the Performance of the Ohio Field Office's day-to-day work.

| Strategy: Implement Integrated Safety Management (ISM) at all OH sites. | 1. Performance Measure: Complete Annual ISMS Review at West Valley by January 31, 2001. |
|---|---|
| | 2. Performance Measure : Complete Annual ISMS Review at Fernald by March 31, 2001. |
| | 3. Performance Measure: Complete Annual ISMS Review at Miamisburg by June 30, 2001. |
| Strategy: Identify and/or clarify ES&H roles and responsibilities. | 4. Performance Measure: Update the OH Functions, Responsibilities, and Authorities Manual (FRAM) in accordance with the revised DOE FRAM I annually by March 31 st . |



OHIO FIELD OFFICE PERFORMANCE PLAN ASSESSMENT- Safety Management

Performance Board Review Matrix - Strategies and Performance Measures

| STATUS FLAGS: On Track | ₩arning | Off Track | Complete | * Strategy or Performance Measure is Inappropriat |
|-------------------------------|---------|-----------|----------|---|
| DEDODERNIG LEGENER (LD) L L L | | | | 0.00 |

REPORTING LEGEND: (AB) Ashtabula; (CL) Columbus; (FN) Fernald; (MB) Miamisburg; (WV) West Valley; (FO) Functional Offices

COMMITMENT FLAGS: Δ FY2001 Upper Level Commitments

| | | | | | | S | ΓATU | s Fla | ΔG | | | | |
|------------|----------------------|-------------------|---|--------|---------|----|------|-------|----|--------|---------|----|--|
| | | |] | Decemb | oer 200 | 00 | | | | Januai | ry 2001 | | |
| STRATEGIES | PERFORMANCE MEASURES | AB CL FN MB WV FO | | | | FO | AB | CL | FN | MB | wv | FO | |

KEY SUCCESS FACTOR A.2. - Enhance Safety Through Work Planning and Assessment

OBJECTIVE 1: Assure all site operations are conducted in a safe manner through proactive planning and surveillance to prevent fatalities, serious accidents, and environmental releases.

| 1. | Strategy: Conduct functional area independent oversight assessments | 5. | Performance Measure : Develop, in coordination with Project Offices, an assessment schedule annually by November 30 th . | | | | | | |
|----|---|----|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 2. | Strategy: Institute an effective Lessons Learned program. | 6. | Performance Measure: Perform Self-Assessment of OH Lessons Learned Program annually by March 31 st . | | | | | | |
| 3. | Strategy: Institute an effective Quality Assurance Program | 7. | Performance Measure : Update OH-Wide QA Program annually by June 30 th . | | | | | | |
| 4. | Strategy : Use VPP to enhance safety. | 8. | Performance Measure: Perform VPP Annual Review at WV by January 31, 2001. | | | | | | |
| | | 9. | Performance Measure : Perform VPP Assessment at FEMP by December 31, 2000. | | | | | | |



OHIO FIELD OFFICE PERFORMANCE PLAN ASSESSMENT- Safety Management

REPORTING LEGEND: (AB) Ashtabula; (CL) Columbus; (FN) Fernald; (MB) Miamisburg; (WV) West Valley; (FO) Functional Offices

Off Track

Performance Board Review Matrix - Strategies and Performance Measures ⊗ Warning

STATUS FLAGS: On Track

| COMMITMENT FLAGS: Δ FY2001 Upper Level Commitments | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------------------|----|----|-------|---------|----|------|-------|----|--------|--------|----|----|
| | | | | | | S | TATU | s Fla | ΔG | | | | |
| | | |] | Decem | ber 200 |)0 | | | | Januai | y 2001 | | |
| STRATEGIES | PERFORMANCE MEASURES | AB | CL | FN | МВ | wv | FO | AB | CL | FN | MB | wv | FO |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

★ Strategy or Performance Measure is Inappropriate

✓ Complete

5. Strategy: Maintain an effective OH Facility Representative 10. **Performance Measure:** Perform self-assessment of the Fac (Fac Rep) Program. Rep Program implementation. Self-assessments completed at FN, MD, WV by June 30, 2001; OCS will consolidated roll-up Fac Rep report by August 30, 2001.

KEY SUCCESS FACTOR A.3.- Improve Safety Monitoring

OBJECTIVE 1: *Utilize qualified personnel to monitor ESH&Q Programs by tracking and trending safety performance*

| Strategy: Meet the DOE Technical Qualification Program (TQP) goals for personnel whose responsibilities impact safety at nuclear facilities. | 11. Performance Measure: Conduct on-going TQP review. Report results to Performance Board mid-year and year-end. | |
|--|---|--|
| 2. Strategy: Evaluate overall effectiveness of safety and health program using performance indicators and establishing targets for performance improvement. | 12. Performance Measure: OCS will prepare and distribute a quarterly report, which tabulates and tracks applicable EM-1 performance indicators; the report is due 30 days after the end of the quarter. | |



Performance Board Review Matrix - Strategies and Performance Measures

| , | STATUS FLAGS: On Track | ⊗ Warning | Off Track | ✓ Complete | ★ Strategy or Performance Measure is Inappropriate | | | | | | |
|---|------------------------|-----------|-----------------------------|-------------------|---|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| | | | | | | | | Statu | s Flag | | |
| | STRATEGIES | | PERFO | RMANCE MEASURES | | | Nov 2000 | Dec 2000 | Jan 2001 | Feb 2001 | Mar 2001 |

KEY SUCCESS FACTOR B.1. - Managers adopt public involvement methods as key strategy to achieve 10-year vision.

OBJECTIVE 1: *DOE* and contractor management at every Ohio project develop a joint public affairs plan based on DOE and Ohio Field Office public involvement doctrine and unique local conditions.

| 1. Strategy: Plans will be brief, flexible, and include five sections (situation, objective, concept, logistics, and evaluation) in accordance with Ohio doctrine. | 1. Performance Measure: Plans are revised as needed but at least annually by September 30 th . | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| Strategy: A process is in place to assess the quality of our external relationships and responsiveness to stakeholders. It will, as a minimum, seek to know the following about our stakeholders: Whether they feel that there is someone at the site to whom they can go to get prompt and accurate information about the site. Whether they feel DOE understands their concerns and act upon them within the bounds of our mission and resources. Whether they are aware of other stakeholders and have some understanding of their concerns. Whether they understand our site mission and view it and our methods for achieving it as legitimate. Whether they are aware of major internal and external obstacles to our achieving our mission. | 2. Performance Measure: A written assessment of the process and results is prepared and used in each year's planning cycle. | | | |



Performance Board Review Matrix - Strategies and Performance Measures

| STATUS FLAGS: On Track | ⊗ Warning | Off Track | Complete | * Strategy | or Performanc | e Measure is Ir | nappropriate | | | | |
|------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------------|------------|---------------|-----------------|--------------|----------|----------|----------|--|
| | | | | | | | Statu | s Flag | | | |
| STRATEGIE | S | PERFC | ORMANCE MEASURE | S | | Nov 2000 | Dec 2000 | Jan 2001 | Feb 2001 | Mar 2001 | |

KEY SUCCESS FACTOR B.2. - Maintain or Improve Cooperative Relationships and Dialogue Among Stakeholders at All Ohio Field Office EM Projects (including Local Residents, State and Federal Regulators, Local Government Officials, Members of Congress, Activists, etc.)

OBJECTIVE 1: Managers accurately identify their stakeholders and apply appropriate techniques to achieve dialogue.

| 1. Strategy: A mechanism is in place at each site to ensure that | 3. Performance Measure: Each Project shall review with the | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| stakeholders have at least one person within our organization | Director of Public the state of stakeholder relations quarterly. | | | |
| who they know and who they can rely upon to keep them | | | | |
| informed or to whom they can go when they have questions. | Ashtabula | | | |
| a. Stakeholders are identified by name. | | | | |
| b. Trained personnel or envoys are designated to be | Columbus | | | |
| responsible for maintaining a relationship with each | | | | |
| stakeholder. | Fernald | | | |
| c. Envoys meet regularly with site management to discuss | | | | |
| issues and share information about site programs and | Miamisburg | | | |
| stakeholder relationships. | | | | |
| d. Each stakeholder is communicated with on a regular | West Valley | | | |
| basis. The frequency and nature of the contact will | | | | |
| depend on circumstances, but will be defined | | | | |
| specifically, and planned, at least, annually. | | | | |



Performance Board Review Matrix - Strategies and Performance Measures

| STATUS FLAGS: On Track | ⊗ Warning | Off Track | Complete | * Strategy | or Performano | ce Measure is I | nappropriate | | | |
|------------------------|-----------|-----------------------------|-----------------|------------|---------------|-----------------|--------------|----------|----------|----------|
| | | | | | | | STATU | s Flag | | |
| STRATEGIES | S | Perfoi | RMANCE MEASURES | | | Nov 2000 | Dec 2000 | Jan 2001 | Feb 2001 | Mar 2001 |

KEY SUCCESS FACTOR B.3. - Increase the Level of Awareness and Acceptance Among the General Public for the Mission and Approaches of the Ohio Field Office

OBJECTIVE 1: *Increase public awareness and acceptance of the Ohio Field Office Missions and the methods for achieving them.*

| | - | 1 3 | | <u> </u> | | |
|----|--|--|--|----------|--|--|
| 1. | Strategy: Public Affairs maintains cordial professional relationships with reporters in our market areas. Public Affairs staff can identify reporters in their market, personal relationships have been established and are maintained. | 4. Performance Measure: The Director of Public Affairs shall assess status of media markets quarterly. | | | | |
| 2. | Strategy: Public Affairs is organized and trained to respond swiftly in a crisis to position itself as the first and best source of information for the public and the media. | 5. Performance Measure: Press conferences, news releases, media and stakeholder contacts are swift and accurate as measured by actual events or annual crisis management drill or table-top exercise, or round-table. Ashtabula | | | | |
| | | Columbus | | | | |
| | | Fernald | | | | |
| | | Miamisburg | | | | |
| | | West valley | | | | |



Performance Board Review Matrix - Strategies and Performance Measures

| STATUS FLAGS: On Track Swarning | ● Off Track ✓ Complete ★ Strategy | or Performance Measure is In | nappropriate | | | |
|---|---|------------------------------|--------------|----------|----------|----------|
| | | | STATUS | s Flag | | |
| Strategies | STRATEGIES PERFORMANCE MEASURES | | | Jan 2001 | Feb 2001 | Mar 2001 |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 3. Strategy: PA develops the means to assess the level of | 6. Performance Measure: PA Will annually (December 31st) | | | | | |
| public awareness around OH sites. | report to the Performance Board assessment results. | | | | | |

KEY SUCCESS FACTOR B.4. - Improve the Extent to Which Diversity is Valued and Used as a Means to Enhance Performance

OBJECTIVE 1: *OH's Workforce is a Place Where Differences are Valued and its make-up is reflective of the citizenry which it represents.*

| 1 | . Strategy: Educate the workforce and promote acceptance of | 7. Performance Measure: Diversity Manager to status programs |
|---|--|--|
| | differences. | conducted in June and December to the OH Performance Board. |
| 2 | . Strategy: Enhance recruitment where under-representation | 8. Performance Measure: Diversity Manager to inform the OH |
| | exists. | Performance Board in June and December on areas where |
| | | under-representation exists. |



Mar 2001

OHIO FIELD OFFICE PERFORMANCE PLAN ASSESSMENT- Business Indicators

Off Track

Performance Board Review Matrix - Strategies and Performance Measures

⊗ Warning

STATUS FLAGS: On Track

STRATEGIES

| COMMITMENT FLAGS: Δ FY2001 Upper Level Commitments |
|---|
|---|

★ Strategy or Performance Measure is Inappropriate

Oct 2000

Nov 2000

STATUS FLAG

Jan 2001

Feb 2001

Dec 2000

✓ Complete

PERFORMANCE MEASURES

KEY SUCCESS FACTOR C.1. - Support the achievement of the OH Vision through effective fiscal management.

OBJECTIVE 1: Effectively manage and account for appropriated funds.

| Strategy: Effectively manage uncosted balances. | 1. Performance Measure: Maintain or reduce uncosted balances, using FY 2000 as benchmark by November 15, 2001. | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| 2. Strategy : Effectively manage unobligated balances. | 2. Performance Measure: Maintain or reduce unobligated balances, using FY 2000 as benchmark. | | | |
| 3. Strategy: Effectively manage support costs. | 3. Performance Measure: Reduce general functional support costs by 10% and mission functional support costs by 5% at Fernald, Miamisburg, and West Valley, using an appropriate benchmark. | | | |
| 4. Strategy: Thoroughly analyze the Ohio portion of the Department-wide financial statement and provide accurate, complete footnote disclosures to Headquarters. | 4. Performance Measure: No significant audit findings on the Ohio portion of the financial statement which result in a qualified opinion on the Department-wide audited financial statement. | | | |



Performance Board Review Matrix - Strategies and Performance Measures

| STATUS FLAGS: O On Track | ● Off Track | y or Performano | ce Measure is I | nappropriate | | | | | |
|--|--|-----------------|-----------------|--------------|----------|----------|----------|--|--|
| COMMITMENT FLAGS: Δ FY2001 Upper Level Commitments | | | | | | | | | |
| | | STATUS FLAG | | | | | | | |
| STRATEGIES | PERFORMANCE MEASURES | Oct 2000 | Nov 2000 | Dec 2000 | Jan 2001 | Feb 2001 | Mar 2001 | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Strategy: Effectively assess adequacy of the contractor internal audit staffing. | 5. Performance Measure: Perform an annual assessment of the contractor internal audit staffing at Fernald, Miamisburg, and West Valley by September 30, 2001. | | | | | | | | |
| OF | BJECTIVE 2: Effectively integrate planning, budget and | performanc | e data. | | | | | | |
| 1. Strategy: Effectively utilize the EM Integrated Planning, Accountability and Budgeting System (IPABS) | 6. Performance Measure: Provide required IPABS deliverables for planning, budget and performance data by due date(s). | | | | | | | | |
| Accountability and Budgeting System (II ABS) | 7. Performance Measure: Submit high quality, well-supported performance-based budget request by due date(s). | | | | | | | | |
| | 2 Support the achievement of the OH Vision through ef | _ | | | | egies | | | |
| Strategy: Determine appropriate course of action and develop path forward at AEMP. | 8. Performance Measure: By September 30, 2001, support Project Director at AEMP in determining the appropriate strategy for a path forward at AEMP that leads to an accelerated end date | | | | | | | | |

Business Indicators - Review Matrix for Strategies and Performance Measures - Champion - Pete Greenwalt 01/03/01 1:23 PM
Section C
Page 2 of 9



Performance Board Review Matrix - Strategies and Performance Measures

| STATUS FLAGS: | O | On Track | \otimes | Warning | | Off Track | √ | Complete | * Strategy or Performance | e Measure is Ina | ppropriate |
|---------------|---|----------|-----------|---------|--|-----------|----------|----------|---------------------------|------------------|------------|
|---------------|---|----------|-----------|---------|--|-----------|----------|----------|---------------------------|------------------|------------|

COMMITMENT FLAGS: Δ FY2001 Upper Level Commitments

| | | | | STATUS FLAG | | | | | | | |
|---|---|----------|----------|-------------|----------|----------|----------|--|--|--|--|
| STRATEGIES | PERFORMANCE MEASURES | Oct 2000 | Nov 2000 | Dec 2000 | Jan 2001 | Feb 2001 | Mar 2001 | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | that is reflected in the baseline. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Strategy: Use performance based contracts that meet mission support needs for major support services contracts at Ohio. | 9. Performance Measure: By December 31, 2000, award a new performance based administrative support service contract for all Ohio sites. | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 10. Performance Measure: By February 15, 2001, issue competitive RFP for new performance based technical support services contract for all Ohio sites. | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 11. Performance Measure: By June 30, 2001, award a new performance based technical support service contract for all Ohio sites. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Strategy: Develop the appropriate long-term closure acquisition strategy for WVDP and solicit competitively for a contractor to achieve it under a performance based contract. | 12. Performance Measure: By June 30, 2001, support Project Director at WVDP in determining the appropriate strategy for a competitive acquisition to achieve long-term closure and secure preliminary HQ approval to proceed, | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 13. Performance Measure: By September 30, 2001, support Project Director at WDVP by issuing a draft competitive RFP for the agreed upon strategy to achieve long-term closure. | | | | | | | | | | |



Performance Board Review Matrix - Strategies and Performance Measures

| STATUS FLAGS: O On Track | ● Off Track ✓ Complete ★ Strategy | or Performanc | e Measure is I | nappropriate | | | |
|---|--|---------------|-----------------|--------------|----------|----------|----------|
| COMMITMENT FLAGS: Δ FY2001 Upper Level Commitments | | | | | | | |
| | | | | STATU | JS FLAG | | |
| STRATEGIES | PERFORMANCE MEASURES | Oct 2000 | Nov 2000 | Dec 2000 | Jan 2001 | Feb 2001 | Mar 2001 |
| Strategy: Evaluate Option I under the incumbent Envirocare Contract and make the Contracting Office determination of whether to exercise the option or develop an alternative acquisition approach. | 14. Performance Measure: By December 31, 2000, provide briefing to Ohio Manager and Deputy Manager on the results of the Contracting Officer's evaluation of the market conditions and of Option I of the Envirocare contract. | vaste disposi | tion strategy | ·. | | | |
| | 15. Performance Measure: By February 15, 2001, take the appropriate action to implement the agreed upon strategy for continued cost-effective support of the Ohio-wide low-level waste disposition program. | | | | | | |
| OBJECTIVE 3: In | nplement cost-plus-incentive-fee (COIF) closure contract strategy at F | FEMP for acce | lerated perfori | nance. | | | |
| Strategy: Award new incentivized closure contract at the FEMP; train FEMP contracting/technical officials on how to monitor contractor performance under new type of contract; | 16. Performance Measure: By November 30, 2000, award CPIF contract at the FEMP. E ffect transition from incumbent to new contract by March 1, 2001. | | | | | | |

Business Indicators - Review Matrix for Strategies and Performance Measures - Champion - Pete Greenwalt 01/03/01 1:23 PM
Section C
Page 4 of 9



Performance Board Review Matrix - Strategies and Performance Measures

STATUS FLAGS: O On Track Strategy or Performance Measure is Inappropriate

COMMITMENT FLAGS: Δ FY2001 Upper Level Commitments

| | | | | STATU | JS FLAG | | |
|--|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|---------|
| STRATEGIES | PERFORMANCE MEASURES | Oct 2000 | Nov 2000 | Dec 2000 | Jan 2001 | Feb 2001 | Mar 200 |
| | | | | | | | |
| and develop monitoring process that facilitates successful | | | | | | | |
| mplementation of the contract. | | | | | | | |
| | 17. Performance Measure: By February 28, 2001, provide training | | | | | | |
| | to all FEMP personnel on appropriate monitoring of contract | | | | | | |
| | performance. Include specific training for the Contracting | | | | | | |
| | Officer's Representative (COR), Alternate CORs, Performance | | | | | | |
| | Monitors (PMs), Facility Representatives (FRs) and any other | | | | | | |
| | group of personnel that has official interaction with the | | | | | | |
| | contractor. | | | | | | |
| | 18. Performance Measure: By June 29, 2001, implement process to | | | | | | |
| | track progress relative to contract targets and long-term fee | | | | | | |
| | measures. | | | | | | |



Mar 2001

OHIO FIELD OFFICE PERFORMANCE PLAN ASSESSMENT- Business Indicators

Off Track

Performance Board Review Matrix - Strategies and Performance Measures

⊗ Warning

STATUS FLAGS: On Track

STRATEGIES

| COMMITMENT FLAGS: | Δ FY2001 Upper Level Commitments | |
|-------------------|---|-------------|
| | | Status Flag |

★ Strategy or Performance Measure is Inappropriate

Oct 2000

Nov 2000

Dec 2000

Jan 2001

Feb 2001

✓ Complete

PERFORMANCE MEASURES

KEY SUCCESS FACTOR C.3. - Support the achievement of the OH Vision through effective utilization of IM resources, human resources and training initiatives.

OBJECTIVE 1: Ensure personnel operations and training functions show improvement in the delivery of services and products.

| 1. | Strategy: Effectively administer personnel operations and | 19. Performance Measure: Conduct a human resources survey by |
|----|---|---|
| | training programs. | February 15, 2001, to determine customer satisfaction and |
| | | identify opportunities for improvement. |
| | | 20. Performance Measure: HR Director contacts project offices |
| | | for performance feedback. This information serves as a basis |
| | | for performance appraisal discussions at the mid-year March |
| | | and the end of year September. |



Performance Board Review Matrix - Strategies and Performance Measures

STATUS FLAGS: O On Track Strategy or Performance Measure is Inappropriate

COMMITMENT FLAGS: Δ FY2001 Upper Level Commitments

| | | | | STATU | JS FLAG | | |
|---|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| STRATEGIES | PERFORMANCE MEASURES | Oct 2000 | Nov 2000 | Dec 2000 | Jan 2001 | Feb 2001 | Mar 2001 |
| | | | | | | | |
| 2. Strategy: Streamline, automate and improve the quality and | 21. Performance Measure: Fully implement Quick Hire by June 20, | | | | | | |
| timeliness of basic personnel and training services and | 2001, to staff all Ohio vacancies. | | | | | | |
| programs. | | | | | | | |
| | 22. Performance Measure: Continue to build personnel and | | | | | | |
| | training functionality into the DOE-wide CHRIS system, e.g., | | | | | | |
| | implement Manager's Self-Service (EIS), update Employee Self- | | | | | | |
| | Service (ESS) and implement management competency for | | | | | | |
| | training (eliminate TQP Tracker) by September 30, 2001. | | | | | | |
| | 23. Performance Measure: Implement DOE On-Line Training | | | | | | |
| | Center and provide assessment of usage by September 30, | | | | | | |
| | 2001. | | | | | | |



Performance Board Review Matrix - Strategies and Performance Measures

STATUS FLAGS: O On Track Strategy or Performance Measure is Inappropriate

COMMITMENT FLAGS: Δ FY2001 Upper Level Commitments

| | | | | STATU | JS FLAG | | |
|------------|----------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| STRATEGIES | PERFORMANCE MEASURES | Oct 2000 | Nov 2000 | Dec 2000 | Jan 2001 | Feb 2001 | Mar 2001 |

OBJECTIVE 2: Maintain a management system that supports the OH Vision, increases communication, and measures success.

| ntain IM capabilities and systems the needs of DOE employees and | 24. Performance Measure: Perform an annual survey of automation needs by November 30 th of each year. | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| | 25. Performance Measure: CRAB will evaluate the survey and subjectively determine based on cost vs. benefits, which projects should be implemented, which should be modified to provide the most benefit at a reasonable cost, and which projects do not meet their cost/benefit criteria. An annual list of recommended project will be developed by January 15 th of each year. | | | |
| h project office and contractor IT tion of information and sharing of | 26. Performance Measure: Conduct meetings with project office and contractor IT organizations at least bi-monthly. | | | |



Performance Board Review Matrix - Strategies and Performance Measures

| STATUS FLAGS: On Track Swarning Off Track | ✓ Complete | Strategy or Performance Measure is Inappropriate |
|---|-------------------|--|
|---|-------------------|--|

COMMITMENT FLAGS: Δ FY2001 Upper Level Commitments

| | | STATUS FLAG | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|-------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|--|--|--|--|
| STRATEGIES | PERFORMANCE MEASURES | Oct 2000 | Nov 2000 | Dec 2000 | Jan 2001 | Feb 2001 | Mar 2001 | | | | |
| 3. Strategy: Establish a cost baseline for each user and compare | 27. Performance Measure: Determine Ohio federal employee 'per- | | | | | | | | | | |
| with commercial, federal and DOE norms. | user' IT costs and compare with Department, Federal and commercial norms (with the goal of maintaining between \$4,000 and \$6,000). | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 28. Performance Measure: Determine Ohio contractor 'per-user' IT cost and compare with Department, Federal and commercial norms (with the goal of maintaining between \$4,000 and \$6,000). | | | | | | | | | | |



Performance Board Review Matrix - Strategies and Performance Measures

| STATUS FLAGS: | On Track | ⊗ Warning | Off Track | ✓ Comple | ete | Strategy or Performance Measure is In | appropriat |
|---------------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------------|-----|---------------------------------------|------------|
|---------------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------------|-----|---------------------------------------|------------|

REPORTING LEGEND: (AB) Ashtabula; (CL) Columbus; (FN) Fernald; (MB) Miamisburg; (WV) West Valley; (FO) Functional Offices

COMMITMENT FLAGS: **D** FY2001 Upper Level Commitments

| | | | | | | S | TATU | s Fl | AG | | | | |
|--|---|---------------|----|----|----|----|------|------|----|--------|---------|----|----|
| | | December 2000 | | | | | | | | Januai | ry 2001 | | |
| STRATEGIES | PERFORMANCE MEASURES | | CL | FN | МВ | WV | FO | AB | CL | FN | МВ | wv | FO |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Strategy: Meet FY 2001 commitments. | 1. Performance Measure: Place 60,000 cubic yards of material in OSDF by September 15, 2001. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 2. Performance Measure: Process and ship 62,497 m3 of waste pit material to permitted commercial disposal facility by September 30, 2001. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 3. Performance Measure: Start Area 3A Excavation by June 1, 2001. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 4. Performance Measure: Ship 235,000-kg bulk (235 MTU) of nuclear material to Portsmouth, the Oak Ridge Operations Office by September 30, 2001. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 5. Performance Measure: Complete disposition of LLW thorium destined for disposal at NTS by September 30, 2001. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 6. Performance Measure: Complete disposition of batches 10 and 11 TSCA inventory by September 30, 2001. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 7. Performance Measure: Disposition a total of 212,000 ft ³ of waste to NTS by September 30, 2001. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 8. Performance Measure: Submit Radon Control System Phase 1 Remedial Action Work Plan by March 1, 2001. (D) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 9. Performance Measure: Submit Silo 3 Remedial Action Work Plan to EPA by May 1, 2001. (D) | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Mission Accomplishment - Review Matrix for Strategies and Performance Measures Champion – Rick Provencher 01/03/01 1:24 PM
Section D
Page 1 of 7



Performance Board Review Matrix - Strategies and Performance Measures

| STATUS FLAGS: O | On Track | ⊗ Warning ■ | Off Track | ✓ Complete | * Strategy or Performance Measure is Inappropriat |
|-----------------|----------|---------------|-----------|------------|---|
|-----------------|----------|---------------|-----------|------------|---|

REPORTING LEGEND: (AB) Ashtabula; (CL) Columbus; (FN) Fernald; (MB) Miamisburg; (WV) West Valley; (FO) Functional Offices

COMMITMENT FLAGS: **D** FY2001 Upper Level Commitments

| | | | | | | S | TATU | JS FL | AG | | | | |
|------------|--|---------------|----|----|----|----|--------------|-------|----|----|----|----|----|
| | | December 2000 | | | | | January 2001 | | | | | | |
| STRATEGIES | PERFORMANCE MEASURES | AB | CL | FN | MB | WV | FO | AB | CL | FN | MB | WV | FO |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 10. Performance Measure: Demolish B Bldg. to slab level by | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | September 30, 2001. (D) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 11. Performance Measure: Submit E Bldg. On-Scene-Coordinator | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Report to regulators by June 18, 2001. (D) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 12. Performance Measure: Transfer Parcel 3 and Parcel 4 to | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | MMCIC by September 30, 2001. (D) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 13. Performance Measure: Submit Bldg. 67 Close Out Report to regulators by June 30, 2001. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 14. Performance Measure: Complete removal of glove box and | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | drum puncture unit from Room 10 WD Bldg. By September 30, 2001. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 15. Performance Measure: Ship 64,500ft ³ of low-level waste to the Nevada Test Site by September 30, 2001. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 16. Performance Measure: Ship for disposal all remediation waste | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | generated in FY01 by September 30, 2001. (D) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 17. Performance Measure: Begin shipments of TRU waste to Savannah River by August 31, 2001. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 18 Performance Measure: Complete Assessment of PRS 66 and | | | | | | | | | | | | |



Off Track

corrective action plan.

February 28, 2001.

2001.

Performance Board Review Matrix - Strategies and Performance Measures ⊗ Warning

STATUS FLAGS: On Track

| REPORTING LEGEND: (AB) Ashtabula; (CL) Columbus; (FN) Ferna | ald; (MB) Miamisburg; (WV) West Valley; (FO) Functional Offices | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|----|----|--------|--------|----|------|-------|----|--------|---------|----|----|
| COMMITMENT FLAGS: D FY2001 Upper Level Commitments | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | S | TATU | s Fla | AG | | | | |
| | | | I | Decemb | er 200 | 0 | | | | Januar | ry 2001 | | |
| STRATEGIES | PERFORMANCE MEASURES | AB | CL | FN | MB | wv | FO | AB | CL | FN | MB | wv | FO |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Conceptual Removal Plan by September 30, 2001. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 19. Performance Measure: Complete FY2001 Release Site | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Assessment Federal Facility Agreement Milestones by | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | September 30, 2001. (D) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 20. Performance Measure: Implement all recommendations | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | generated by Bioassay Investigation in accordance with | | | | | | | | | | | | |

21. Performance Measure: Complete NE Island Administration Bldg. And achieve beneficial occupancy by September 30,

23. Performance Measure: Close Out SW Bldg. Area F Safe Shut

22. Performance Measure: Submit Level 1 BCP to HQ by

Down Activities by September 30, 2001.

✓ Complete

★ Strategy or Performance Measure is Inappropriate



Performance Board Review Matrix - Strategies and Performance Measures

| STATUS FLAGS: O | On Track | ⊗ Warning ■ | Off Track | ✓ Complete | * Strategy or Performance Measure is Inappropriat |
|-----------------|----------|---------------|-----------|------------|---|
|-----------------|----------|---------------|-----------|------------|---|

REPORTING LEGEND: (AB) Ashtabula; (CL) Columbus; (FN) Fernald; (MB) Miamisburg; (WV) West Valley; (FO) Functional Offices

COMMITMENT FLAGS: **D** FY2001 Upper Level Commitments

| | | STATUS FLAG | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|--|---------------|----|----|----|----|--------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| | | December 2000 | | | | | January 2001 | | | | | | |
| STRATEGIES | PERFORMANCE MEASURES | AB | CL | FN | МВ | WV | FO | AB | CL | FN | МВ | wv | FO |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | _ | | | | |
| | 24. Performance Measure: Remove Alpha/Gamma Cell Doors by November 10, 2000. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 25. Performance Measure : Remove Bioshield, Pedestal and Divider Wall by December 12, 2000. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 26. Performance Measure: Obtain certification to ship LLW to Nevada Test Site by January 2, 2001. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 27. Performance Measure : Complete the JN-1 Demolition Study Contract and implement by April 2, 2001. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 28. Performance Measure: Perform 2 nd Floor Decon Completion Survey in JN-3 by July 6, 2001. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 29. Performance Measure: Remove material from Waste Storage Shed by June 31, 2001. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 30. Performance Measure: Decon/Stabilize High Level Cell Surfaces by September 7, 2001. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 31. Performance Measure: Ship 12,320ft ³ of low-level waste to the Nevada Test Site by September 30, 2001. | | | | | | | | | | | | |



Performance Board Review Matrix - Strategies and Performance Measures

| STATUS FLAGS: On Track | ⊗ Warning | Off Track | ✓ Complete | * Strategy or Performance Measure is Inappropriat |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|---|
| REPORTING LEGEND: (AB) Ashtabula | ; (CL) Columbus; (FN) Fe | ernald; (MB) Miamisburg; (W | V) West Valley; (FO) Fund | etional Offices |

COMMITMENT FLAGS: **D** FY2001 Upper Level Commitments

| | | | | | | S | TATU | JS FL | AG | | | | |
|------------|---|---------------|----|----|----|----|------|-------|--------------|----|----|----|----|
| | | December 2000 | | | | | | | January 2001 | | | | |
| STRATEGIES | PERFORMANCE MEASURES | AB | CL | FN | МВ | WV | FO | AB | CL | FN | МВ | WV | FO |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 32. Performance Measure: Building RF-6 Addition Remediation | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | complete by August 30, 2001. (D) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 33. Performance Measure: Building RF-6 Remediation complete | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | by September 28, 2001. (D) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 34. Performance Measure: Building RF-3 Remediation complete | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | by September 2001. (D) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 35. Performance Measure: 312 cubic meters of PCB Soil Removal | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | to Envirocare begins by June 2001. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 36. Performance Measure: Lead Brick Forming begins by July | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 2001. Make 88 cubic meters by September 30, 2001. | | | | | | | | | | | | 4 |
| | 37. Performance Measure: 12 cubic meters of STP Waste to | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | TSCA by September 2001. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 38. Performance Measure: STP Waste on-site | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Microencapsulation complete by July 2001. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 39. Performance Measure: Ship 2,000ft ³ of low-level waste to the Nevada Test Site by September 30, 2001. | | | | | | | | | | | | |



STATUS FLAG

OHIO FIELD OFFICE PERFORMANCE PLAN ASSESSMENT- Mission Accomplishment and Compliance

Performance Board Review Matrix - Strategies and Performance Measures

| STATUS FLAGS: | On Track | ⊗ Warning | | Off Track | √ | Complete | * Strategy or Performance Measure is Inappropriate |
|---------------|----------|-----------|--|-----------|----------|----------|--|
|---------------|----------|-----------|--|-----------|----------|----------|--|

REPORTING LEGEND: (AB) Ashtabula; (CL) Columbus; (FN) Fernald; (MB) Miamisburg; (WV) West Valley; (FO) Functional Offices

COMMITMENT FLAGS: **D** FY2001 Upper Level Commitments

| | | December 2000 | | | January 2001 | | | | | | | | |
|------------|--|---------------|----|----|--------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| STRATEGIES | PERFORMANCE MEASURES | AB | CL | FN | МВ | wv | FO | AB | CL | FN | МВ | WV | FO |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | _ | | | I | |
| | 40. Performance Measure: Complete flushes of Tanks 8D-1 and | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 8D-4; the Concentrator Feed Makeup Tank; Submerged Bed | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Scrubber; Liquid Waste Treatment System evaporator; | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Supernatant Treatment System; and Sludge Mobilization | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | System by August 15, 2001. (D) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 41. Performance Measure: Complete sampling and | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | characterization of radionuclide inventory for High Level | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Waste Tanks 8D-1 and *D-2 and summarize in an inventory | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | report by August 30, 2001. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 40. Performance Measure: Develop Waste Incidental to | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Preprocessing Program in accordance with DOE O 435.1 by | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | March 31, 2001. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 41. Performance Measure: Ship 15,000 cubic feet of Class A Low- | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Level Waste off-site for disposal by September 30, 2001. (D) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 42. Performance Measure: Complete Construction of the Building | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Enclosure which will house the Remote Handled Waste | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Facility by September 30, 2001. (D) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 43. Performance Measure: Begin the removal of waste from the | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Mission Accomplishment - Review Matrix for Strategies and Performance Measures Champion – Rick Provencher 01/03/01 1:24 PM Section D

Page 6 of 7



Performance Board Review Matrix - Strategies and Performance Measures

| STATUS FLAGS: O On Track Strategy or Performance Measure is I | Inappropriate |
|---|---------------|
|---|---------------|

REPORTING LEGEND: (AB) Ashtabula; (CL) Columbus; (FN) Fernald; (MB) Miamisburg; (WV) West Valley; (FO) Functional Offices

COMMITMENT FLAGS: **D** FY2001 Upper Level Commitments

| | | STATUS FLAG | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|---|-------------|----|--------|---------|----|----|----|--------------|----|----|----|----|--|
| | | | I | Decemb | er 2000 | 0 | | | January 2001 | | | | | |
| STRATEGIES | PERFORMANCE MEASURES | AB | CL | FN | МВ | wv | FO | AB | CL | FN | МВ | wv | FO | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Process Mechanical Cell by September 30, 2001. (D) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 44. Performance Measure: Perform necessary activities including document preparation, assessments, certification, etc., to begin shipping LLW to NTS by July 31, 2001. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 45. Performance Measure: Complete installation and start-up of the General Purpose Cell's bridge crane and manipulator by June 30, 2001. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 46. Performance Measure: Complete the preparations and the needed approvals for shipping the Spent Nuclear Fuel to INEEL by March 31, 2001. (D) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 47. Performance Measure: Complete the data collection and report to evaluate the effectiveness/success of the Pilot Permeable Treatment Wall for mitigation of the SR-90 groundwater plume by March 31, 2001. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 48. Performance Measure: Ship 700ft ³ of low-level waste to the Nevada Test Site by September 30, 2001. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |



Performance Board Review Matrix - Strategies and Performance Measures

| STATUS FLAGS: | On Track | ⊗ Warning | • Off Track | ✓ Comp | Complete * Strategy or Performance Measure is Inappropriate | | | | | | |
|---------------|----------|-----------|-----------------|---------------|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|------------|--|
| | | | | | | | STAT | TUS FLAG | | | |
| STRATEG | HES | PERFO | RMANCE MEASURES | | Oct 2000 | Nov 2000 | Dec 2000 | Jan 2001 | Feb 2001 | March 2001 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |

KEY SUCCESS FACTOR E.1. – Improvement in results of Malcolm Baldrige Fitness Review

OBJECTIVE 1: Assessment Management

| 1. Strategy: The Ohio Field Office will conduct an annual performance survey as a measurement and motivational tool to increase customer satisfaction. | 1. Performance Measure: The Manager shall appoint a survey team made up of a cross section of OH employees NLT November 30, 2000. |
|--|--|
| (Champion – Jack Craig) | 2. Performance Measure: The survey team shall administer a customer service satisfaction questionnaire to a randomly selected sample of Ohio employees NLT January 30, 2001. |
| | 3. Performance Measure: The survey team will conduct interviews in accordance with the Malcolm Baldrige process and report their analysis of the results NLT March 15, 2001. |
| | 4. Performance Measure: The Performance Board will create a corrective action plan based on the analysis NLT April 30, 2001. |

Performance Board Review Matrix - Strategies and Performance Measures

STATUS FLAGS: On Track



1 chormance Board Review Matrix - Strategies and 1 chormance Measures

⊗ Warning

● Off Track ✓ Complete

★ Strategy or Performance Measure is Inappropriate

| Strategies | PERFORMANCE MEASURES | Oct 2000 | Nov 2000 | Dec 2000 | Jan 2001 | Feb 2001 | March 2001 |
|------------|----------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-------------------|

OBJECTIVE: 2. Leadership

| 1. Strategy: Increase management/employee interaction. | 5. Performance Measure: The Ohio Field Office Manager will |
|---|---|
| (Champion - Office of the Manager) | annually hold at least three brown-bag lunches in |
| | Mianmisburg and will visit the other sites at least once a year |
| | as travel permits. Monthly All-Hands meetings will continue |
| | with the Manager presenting current information as well as |
| | taking questions. At the majority of the All-Hands meetings |
| | one of the direct reports will make a presentation on the |
| | status/progress of their organization towards closure and other |
| | items of general interest to the audience. |
| 2. Strategy: Managers and Supervisors will resolve personnel | 6. Performance Measure: Continue offering supervisory |
| problems more timely when possible. | training on HR management including work force discipline. |
| (Champion – Ken Briggs) | |
| | 7. Performance Measure: Send messages at All-Hands |
| | meetings concerning management expectations and equitable |
| | treatment. (June 2000) |
| | 8. Performance Measure: Performance appraisal criteria for |
| | supervisors will be updated to include leadership criteria by |
| | September 30, 2000. |

Performance Board Review Matrix - Strategies and Performance Measures



| STATUS FLAGS:O On Track | Track Complete | ★ Strategy or Performance Measure is Inappropriate |
|-------------------------|------------------|---|
|-------------------------|------------------|---|

| | | STATUS FLAG | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|-------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-------|--|--|--|--|
| STRATEGIES | PERFORMANCE MEASURES | Oct 2000 | Nov 2000 | Dec 2000 | Jan 2001 | Feb 2001 | March | | | | |
| | | | | | | | 2001 | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Strategy: Foster honesty, openness and trust in all organizations. (Champion – Office of the Manager) | 9. Performance Measure: All managers and supervisors will take action to give employees within their organization more time and attention. Examples of actions may include: brown-bag lunches walk around time fixed hours of open door time hold one-on-one meetings | | | | | | | | | | |

OBJECTIVE 3: Strategic Planning

| 1. | Strategy: Align the Strategic Plan with project baselines. | 10. Performance Measure: The next update of the Ohio | | | |
|----|---|--|--|--|--|
| | (Champion – Office of the Manager) | Strategic Plan (Fall 2000) will realign and use the current | | | |
| | | project baselines. The plan will also include an explanation | | | |
| | | that clearly delineates the difference between our current | | | |
| | | project baseline (where we are now) vs. the Vision (where we | | | |
| | | want to be). | | | |

Off Track

Performance Board Review Matrix - Strategies and Performance Measures

⊗ Warning

STATUS FLAGS: On Track



| STRATEGIES | PERFORMANCE MEASURES | Oct 2000 | Nov 2000 | Dec 2000 | Jan 2001 | Feb 2001 | March 2001 |
|---|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|---------------|
| | OBJECTIVE 4: Customer and Market Focus | | | | | | |
| Strategy: Clarify team member's roles and responsibilities within organizations. (Champion – Ward Best) | 11. Performance Measure: Issue Roles and Responsibility matrix by March 31, 2000. | | | | | | |
| (Champion – Rick Provencher) | 12. Performance Measure: Project Offices initiate or continue PIT effort to better define and improve the roles and responsibilities. Following the definition of the revised R&R matrix, conduct group briefing/discussion and review annually. (September 30, 2000) | | | | | | |
| | OBJECTIVE 5: Information and Analysis | | | | | | |
| 1. Strategy: Subject performance measures to periodic process improvement reviews with a goal of improving their quality while limiting the quantity. (Champion – Office of the Manager) | 13. Performance Measure: The Manager's Office will convene a small team of Senior Managers to inventory the corporate and project performance measures that a now being statused (as of May 1, 2000). This team will work with the metric owners to validate the measures requirement for continued statusing or recommend it's removal by July 15, 2000. For those measures that are recommended for retention, the quality of the measure will also be assessed by July 15, 2000. | | | | | | |
| (Champion – Ken Briggs) | 14. Performance Measure: CRAB should evaluate options for updating TIPS or pursuing other options by June 30, 2000. | | | | | | |

✓ Complete

★ Strategy or Performance Measure is Inappropriate

Performance Board Review Matrix - Strategies and Performance Measures



STATUS FLAGS: On Track

⊗ Warning

Off Track

✓ Complete

★ Strategy or Performance Measure is Inappropriate

| | | | STATUS FLAG | | | | | | | |
|----|---|---|-------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|---------------|--|--|
| | STRATEGIES | PERFORMANCE MEASURES | Oct 2000 | Nov 2000 | Dec 2000 | Jan 2001 | Feb 2001 | March 2001 | | |
| 2. | Strategy: Subject the Lessons Learned Program to a process improvement review. (Champion – Ward Best) | 15. Performance Measure: OCS will develop a corrective action plan after completion of a planned self-assessment (May 19, 2000). | | | | | | | | |
| 3. | Strategy: Resolve and communicate the management of the Technical Qualification program and its Individual Development Program with the conversion to the CHRIS. (Champions – Ward Best/Ken Briggs) | 16. Performance Measure: HR and OCS will develop a joint memo and make an All-Hands meeting presentation by August 2000. | | | | | | | | |

OBJECTIVE 6: Human Resource Focus

| Strategy: Address ambiguity associated with the OH Awards Program. (Champion – Ken Briggs) | 17. Performance Measure: By May 31, 2000, HR will prepare a memo for the Manager's signature addressing the following issues: The linking of awards to the performance appraisal system. The Manager's expectation on the timelines of awards. The intended use of the Manager's Award Pool and the Awards Store. | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| Strategy: Revisit the continued use of the 360 appraisal system.(Champion – Ken Briggs) | 18. Performance Measure: Survey all-hands on the continued use of the 360 system by April 1, 2000. | | | |

Performance Board Review Matrix - Strategies and Performance Measures



1 cholinance Board Review Matrix - Strategies and 1 cholinance Measure

 Off Track

✓ Complete

★ Strategy or Performance Measure is Inappropriate

| | | STATUS FLAG | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|-------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|---------------|--|--|--|
| STRATEGIES | PERFORMANCE MEASURES | Oct 2000 | Nov 2000 | Dec 2000 | Jan 2001 | Feb 2001 | March 2001 | | | |
| 3. Strategy: Establish a timetable for completion of the employee transition plan. (Champion – Ken Briggs) | 19. Performance Measure: The OH Federal Employee Transition Program Plan was completed on December 24, 1997. The OH Retention-Transition Alliance will issue a draft communication plan by March 24, 2000 and a final communication plan by April 10, 2000. This plan will outline the various vehicles for communicating retention/transition activity. OBJECTIVE 7: Process Management | | | | | | | | | |
| Strategy: Evaluate and streamline the administrative and technical reporting requirements from the internal/external customers and consolidate the number of operational procedures for internal work processes. (Champion – Rick Provencher) (Champion – Pete Greenwalt) | 20. Performance Measure: By June 1, 2000, establish a PIT to develop and demonstrate, using the MEMP as a pilot site, an accelerated exit strategy through the reduction/elimination of administrative and technical requirements. Team membership will consist of representatives from MEMP (lead), BWXTO, OCC, and AAM, with ad hoc support from the Office of the Manager, CFO, and OCS. Target completion is December 31, 2000. 21. Performance Measure: Provide a Travel Manager user document to all employees by March 31, 2000. Provide training to all sites, requiring it, by September 30, 2000. Will | | | | | | | | | |

coordinate with HRD/IM to determine the systems requirements for each project by May 31, 2000.

Performance Board Review Matrix - Strategies and Performance Measures

⊗ Warning



STATUS FLAGS: On Track

Off Track **✓** Complete **★** Strategy or Performance Measure is Inappropriate

| | | STATUS FLAG | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|--|-------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|---------------|--|--|--|
| Strategies | PERFORMANCE MEASURES | Oct 2000 | Nov 2000 | Dec 2000 | Jan 2001 | Feb 2001 | March 2001 | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| (Champion – Ward Best) | 22. Performance Measure: Better define the mission of OCS by updating its Technical Management Plan by July 30, 2000 and adding an element on communications. | | | | | | | | | |
| (Champion – Tony Eitreim) | 23. Performance Measure: The continued development of a records management process will be achieved by the following: | | | | | | | | | |
| | Ohio functional offices, MEMP and FEMP will complete RIDS for the records in their possession by May 31, 2000. | | | | | | | | | |
| | All active and inactive non-classified records at BWXTO and FDF will be inventoried and scheduled by September 30, 2000. | | | | | | | | | |
| | A formal Records Management Plan for OH will be prepared by December 31, 2000. | | | | | | | | | |

Performance Board Review Matrix - Strategies and Performance Measures



STATUS FLAGS: On Track ⊗ Warning Off Track **✓** Complete **★** Strategy or Performance Measure is Inappropriate

| | | STATUS FLAG | | | | | |
|------------|----------------------|-------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|---------------|
| STRATEGIES | Performance Measures | Oct 2000 | Nov 2000 | Dec 2000 | Jan 2001 | Feb 2001 | March 2001 |

| | | OBJECTIVE 8: Business Results | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| 1 | Strategy: Continue strong management focus on working external relationships to obtain sufficient budget to support the Vision. | Performance Measure: Communicate cost and schedule impacts of all FY2002 Budget scenarios to stakeholders/regulators by May 1, 2000. | | | |
| | (Champion – Pete Greenwalt)) | Performance Measure: Communicate cost and schedule impacts of FY2001 Congressional Request to stakeholders/regulators by February 21, 2000. | | | |
| | | Performance Measure: Communicate all policy changes and results of all non-embargoed decisions to stakeholder/regulators as they occur (e.g. funding profiles, IRB, etc.) | | | |